



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/696,436 | 10/24/2000 | Ted J. Cooper | 80398.P350 | 3904 |

7590 02/17/2004

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

YE, LIN

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2612

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/696,436

Applicant(s)

COOPER, TED J.

Examiner

Lin Ye

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The **disclosure** concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for

Art Unit: 2612

patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hel-or et al. U.S. Patent 6,404,918.

Referring to claim 1, the Hel-or reference discloses in Figures 1-3, an image processing method comprising: capturing an image (by image sensor, see Col. 3, lines 9-18); and providing edge enhancements (e.g., edge smoothing) to the captured image as part of a demosaicing process (See Col. 5, lines 56-63).

Referring to claim 2, the Hel-or reference discloses performing post demosaicing processing on the captured image (See Figure 3, after step 39 to generate new RGB image can be considered as post demosaicing processing); and outputting the processed image (in steps 36-37).

Referring to claim 3, the Hel-or reference discloses wherein providing the edge enhancements includes: creating a brightness map (image is then separated into a luminance band Y, and two chrominance bands, I and Q as shown in step 32 in Figure 3) of the captured image.

Referring to claim 4, the Hel-or reference discloses wherein providing the edge enhancements further includes: detecting edges of the captured image using the brightness map (using the luminance band Y in step 32 in Figure 3); creating a mask image (new Y-image) from the edge detected brightness map (generate new Y-image from smoothed component images in step 35 in Figure 3); and performing unsharp edge enhancement (edge smoothing) from the masked image (See step 39 in Figure 3 and Col. 6, lines 53-60).

Referring to claim 5, the Hel-or reference discloses wherein providing the edge enhancements further includes: blending multiplicatively the unsharp edge enhanced image with the brightness map (Y image); (e.g., blending the isotropic smoothing process in step 38 to step 39 can be considered as blending multiplicatively the unsharp edge enhanced image with the brightness map).

Referring to claim 6, the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claim 1.

Referring to claim 7, the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claim 2.

Referring to claim 8, the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claim 3.

Referring to claim 9, the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claim 4.

Referring to claim 10, the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claim 5.

Referring to claim 11, (It should be noted that the preamble does not anticipate this claim) the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claim 1.

Referring to claim 12, the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claim 2.

Referring to claim 13, the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claim 3.

Art Unit: 2612

Referring to claim 14, the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claim 4.

Referring to claim 15, the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claim 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hel-or et al. U.S. Patent 6,404,918 in view of Lathrop et al. U.S. Patent 6,288,743.

Referring to claim 16, the Hel-or reference discloses all subject matter as discussed in respected claim 1, except the reference does not explicitly state a memory to store the captured image and a processor to provide edge enhancements to the captured image in the memory.

The Lathrop reference discloses in Figure 1, an image processing device comprising: a image sensor (CCD 16); a memory device (20) to store the captured image; and a processor (22) to provide edge enhancements to the captured image in the memory (Col 3, lines 30-42 and Col 4, lines 5-36). The Lathrop reference is evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see more advantages the image processing device including a memory device to store the captured image for doing image processing (such as edge enhancements) late and

Art Unit: 2612

avoiding to loss any image data during the processing. For that reason, it would have been obvious to the image-processing device having a memory to store the captured image and a processor to provide edge enhancements to the captured image in the memory disclosed by Hel-or.

Referring to claim 17, the Lathrop reference discloses wherein the image capturing unit includes a charge-couple device (CCD) array (CCD 16, see Col. 3, lines 16-20) phototransistors, or photodiodes.

Referring to claim 18, the Lathrop reference discloses wherein the output unit is a display device (display monitor 12).

Referring to claim 19, the Hel-or and Lathrop references disclose all subject matter as discussed with respected to same comment as with claims 2 and 18.

6. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hel-or et al. U.S. Patent 6,404,918 in view of Lathrop et al. U.S. Patent 6,288,743 and Tao et al. U.S. Patent 6,304,294.

Referring to claim 20, the Hel-or and Lathrop references disclose all subject matter as discussed in respected claim 16-19, except the reference does not explicitly state the post demosaicing processing is a white balancing processing.

The Tao reference discloses in Figure 1, an imaging apparatus has a demosaicing processing (102); and a post demosaicing processing (chromatic adaptation 104) for a white balancing processing (See Col. 3, lines 31-51). The Tao reference is evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see more advantages the post demosaicing processing is a white balancing or other image processing so that the scene illumination can be estimate

Art Unit: 2612

more accurately. For that reason, it would have been obvious to the post demosaicing processing is a white balancing processing or a chromatic improvement processing disclosed by Hel-or.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Lin Ye** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3250**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy R Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.


Application/Control Number: 09/696,436

Page 8

Art Unit: 2612

Lin Ye

February 9, 2004


WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600